

REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) in view of Rondeau (USP 5850433). Claims 1-5, 10-21, 24 and 28-32 were further rejected under 35 USC §102(e) in view of Borman (USP 5890172). Claims 6-9, 22-23 and 25-27, were further rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of Borman and Dekelbaum (USP 5838682) combined.

In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 5, 12, 26-28 and 31-32, and amended claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-25, and 29-30 to clearly particularize the “value added content provision” invention being claimed, distinguishing it over the cited references. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure. No new matters are introduced.

More specifically, claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-18 and 24-25 have been amended to clearly claim a “value added content provision” method performed on a bridge server. Claims 19-23 have now been amended to clearly claim such bridge server. As to claims 29-30, they have now been amended to clearly claim a client system equipped to practice the client aspect of the novel method of the present invention (allowing the bridge server to be the “provider” of the additional content).

In particular, amended claim 1 now recites the limitations of “receiving by the bridge server from a client system a request for content targeting a network server; and providing by the bridge server in response to the received request additional content ...”. By virtue of well settled claim interpretation rules, the bridge server is separate and distinct from the other recited entities, the client system (where the request for content

originates), and the targeted network server (where the request for content is to be satisfied). Accordingly, the invention being claimed is a novel method where the additional content is provided by a separate and distinct third party bridge sever, not the network server where the request for content is to be satisfied, nor the client system where the request for content originated.

Rondeau teaches a system and method for providing an on-line directory service. Under Rondeau (referencing its Fig. 1), a client for directory information is originated from the client system (18) targeted for directory server (28). Applicants agree, under Rondeau, additional contents, such as a telephone interface for initiating a call and advertisement, in addition to the requested directory information are provided to the client system (18) in response. *However, the issue remains what does Rondeau teach in terms of who provides these additional contents.*

In the case of advertisement, Rondeau clearly disclosed on col. 6, lines 14-16, that the advertisements are stored in associated database (14). Thus Applicants submit in the case of advertisement, Rondeau clear teaches provision by the directory server (28), who services the request for content.

In the case of the telephone icon for initiating a call, Applicants have reviewed Rondeau thoroughly, but cannot locate passages where Rondeau expressly stated how the call icon is provided to the client system (18). In col. 8, lines 1-11, where Rondeau is describing the operational flow of Fig. 2, it merely stated that "the service forwards directory listing from database 14 (which is associated with server (28)) to computer 18 ... the user may obtain additional information about a given entity ... by selecting an icon

or hypertext associated with the listing ... The user selects a telephone icon ... to place a telephone call ...” However, in giving the overall description, on col. 5, lines 57-60, Rondeau stated that “Database server 28 delivers information to the computer user’s browser software and interprets search requests or queries for database retrieval”. Furthermore, Rondeau also on the same col., lines 34-49, described terminal server 26 as merely a conventional communication device, such as the Robocop available from CISCO/US Robotics. Thus, Applicants submit the telephone icon must either an integral part of the HTML pages retrieved from database (14) or added by the directory server (28) prior to sending the HTML pages to client system (18).

In any event, there is no clear and convincing evidence that Rondeau anticipated the provision of additional content by a third party bridge server that is separate and distinct from the client system who originated the request for content, and the network server where the request for content is serviced.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Rondeau, and therefore patentable over Rondeau.

Similarly, Borman teaches a method and apparatus for retrieving data from a network. In particular, Borman teaches a novel “jumper” disposed on the client system (see. e.g. Fig. 1), that parses every received HTML page for links, and presents the user with an added window of these links, to allow the user to retrieve these linked pages in a more user friendly manner. Since the “jumper” is disposed on the client, the parsing, the building and the presentation of the window of links are all performed on the client system. Thus, Borman merely stands for the proposition of having the client system to

generate the “additional content” based on received requested content. Borman nevertheless do not teach or suggest the claimed provision of additional content by a third party bridge server that is separate and distinct from the client system who originated the request for content and the network server where the request for content is serviced.

Accordingly, claim 1 is also not anticipated by Borman, and therefore, patentable over Borman.

Since Dekelbaum does not cure the above discussed deficiency in teachings by Borman, claim 1 is also patentable over Borman even when combined with Dekelman.

Claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-18 are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, by virtue of at least their dependency, claims 2-4, 6-11 and 13-18 are also patentable over Rondeau or Borman (with or without Dekelbaum).

Claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-18 also contain additional limitations rendering them further patentable over Rondeau or Borman (with or without Dekelbaum), however they need not all be discussed at this time. Nevertheless, for illustrative purpose, Applicants want to point out e.g., in the case of claims 13-15, they incrementally include the limitations requiring the bridge server to return a marked version of the received request to the client system for resubmission, removing the mark up upon re-receive of the marked up request, and then forwarding the “cleaned up” request to the targeted network server. None of these limitations are anticipated or suggested by the cited references.

With respect to claims 19-23, the above patentability reasons for claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-18 apply equally. Accordingly, claims 19-23 are also patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claims 24-25 and 29-30, for at least the above enumerated reasons why claims 13-15 are further patentable over Rondeau or Borman (with or without Dekelbaum), claims 24-25 and 29-30 are also patentable over these references.


Thus, in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-25, and 29-30, as amended, are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner grant allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: October 6, 1999

by: _____



Aloysius T.C. AuYeung
Reg. No.: 35,432

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
Phone: (503) 684-6200